

PCG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,808	04/30/2001	Madan Mohan R. Appiah	MSFT-0220/158505.1	3196

7590 09/21/2004

Jonathan M. Waldman, Esq.
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,808

Applicant(s)

APPIAH ET AL.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>June 4, 2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on April 30, 2001. Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1-35 represent method, apparatus and product for unified remote control access.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-7, 9, 12-30, 32-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paroz, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125.

Paroz teaches the invention as claimed including a remote control system (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Paroz teaches method of accessing a first computing device from a second computing comprising:

connecting to a first computing device from a second computing device using a communication protocol (see figs. 1-7; col. 7, lines 50-65, Bookspan discloses connecting from a second computer with a local computer); and

controlling one of the first computing device and the second computing device from the other of the first computing device and the second computing device in a reversible connection (see col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 10, lines 55-65, Paroz discloses that the second computer controls the display window of the local computer).

As to claim 2, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving an instruction to reverse the connection and using the one computing device to control the other computing device (see col. 7-8, Paroz discloses that the controlling is performed in a reverse manner).

As to claim 3, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein connecting to the first computing device comprises:

sending a connection request from the first computing device to the second

computing device, receiving the connection request at the second computing device, and establishing a connection between the first and second computing devices responsive to the connection request (see col. 8, lines 10-20, Paroz discloses that the connection is established in response to a connection request).

As to claim 4, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising authenticating the first computing device (see col. 8, lines 10-20).

As to claim 5, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising entering one of a listening mode and a control mode at the first computing device and entering the other of the listening mode and the control mode at the second computing device (see col. 10, lines 60-67, Paroz discloses that either of the computers can enter into read mode or control mode).

As to claim 6, Paroz teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising toggling from the listening mode to the control mode at one of the first computing device and the second computing device, and toggling from the control mode to the listening mode at the other of the first computing device and the second computing device (see col. 9-10).

As to claim 7, Paroz teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising reversibly toggling the first computing device between the listening mode and the control mode and reversibly toggling the second computing device between the listening mode and the control mode (see col. 9-10).

As to claim 9, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein controlling one of the first computing device and the second computing device using the other of the first computing device and the second computing device comprises receiving an input at the other computing device and sending the input to the one device, the one device processing the input (see col. 9-10).

As to claim 10, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising releasing control responsive to an input received at one of the first computing device and the second computing device (see col. 9-10).

As to claim 12, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein connecting to the first computing device comprises:

determining if the communication protocol is one of a predetermined plurality of protocols; and

if the communication protocol is one of the predetermined plurality of protocols, using the communication protocol in establishing the reversible connection between the first computing device and the second computing device (see co. 7, lines 55-60; col. 8, lines 55-65).

Claims 13-30, 32-33, and 35 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-7, 9-10, 12 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 11, 31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz.

Paroz teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a remote control system (see abstract).

As to claim 8, Paroz teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising requesting from one of the computing devices to the other of the computing devices to toggle from one of the listening mode and the control mode to the other mode (see col. 7-10).

Paroz does not explicitly teach the limitation of requesting permission. Paroz does teach that the mediator resident at the server allows for control mode and read only mode access (see col. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Paroz by specifying the functionality of allowing the control or read

only modes as a response to a permission request since the same functionality of controlling the mode at the clients is achieved.

As to claim 11, Paroz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein connecting to the first computing device using the second computing device is responsive to one of join collaboration request (see col. 1-2).

Paroz fails to teach that the request is responsive to a help request, a training session initiation, and a network administration task.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of connecting responsive to a help request, a training session initiation, and a network administration task is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Paroz by specifying a help request, a training session initiation, and a network administration task in place of the join collaboration request since such actions represent some form of collaboration.

Claims 31, and 34 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 8, 11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The central official fax number for the group is (703) 872-9306.



Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157